

**REMARKS**

In the October 19, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 were pending in the application; rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); and rejected claims 1-6, 11-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 5,930,508 to Faraboschi et al. (Reference AD in the September 24, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement) and 5,881,307 to Park et al. (Reference A in the August 15, 2003 Office Action) were cited. Claims 1-6, 11-13, 15 and 16 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to recite that a parallel processor according to the present invention utilizes two instruction word formats and that there is "a second arrangement of the basic instructions corresponding to an arrangement of the instruction execution units" (e.g., claim 1, last three lines). The instruction word formats are described, for example, on pages 17-21 with reference to Figs. 9 and 10.

In the prior art, Faraboschi et al. discloses selection of an execution unit for execution of an instruction by use of a dispersal code indicated by an instruction word. As a result, the method taught by Faraboschi et al. needs to provide each basic instruction with information indicating which integer execution unit is to be used. In comparison, the present invention provides the benefit of not requiring dispersal codes in instructions to determine how an instruction is executed. According to the invention an arrangement of basic instructions corresponding to the arrangement of execution units is generated and supplied to the execution units based on instruction word format and types of basic instructions. Thus, "the instruction words fetched by the instruction unit ... [require] no attached dispersal information" (claim 16, lines 12-13) to determine the "arrangement of the instruction execution units" (claim 16, last two lines).

Nothing has been cited or found in Park et al. suggesting modification of Faraboschi et al. to meet the limitations recited in claims 1 and 16. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1 and 16 patentably distinguish over Faraboschi et al. taken alone or in combination with Park et al.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 2-8, 11-13 and 15, which depend from claim 1, also patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

**Summary**

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-8, 11-13, 15 and 16 are in a condition suitable for allowance.

Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3/17/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501